

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

S.L.,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY,

Respondent;

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY HUMAN
SERVICES DEPARTMENT,

Real Party in Interest.

H039591

(Santa Cruz County

Super. Ct. No. DP002518)

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner S.L. is the mother of J., the child at issue in this juvenile dependency case. She has filed a petition for extraordinary writ seeking review of the juvenile court's orders terminating her reunification services and setting a Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26¹ permanency planning hearing. We understand mother, a self-represented litigant, to argue that she was not provided with enough unsupervised visitation to form a bond with J.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise indicated.

For the reasons stated below, we find that mother has not shown that the juvenile court's findings and orders are not supported by substantial evidence and therefore we will deny the writ petition.

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. Section 300 Petition

On October 4, 2011, the Santa Cruz County Human Services Department (the Department) filed a petition under section 300, subdivision (b) [failure to protect] alleging that J., age nine months, came within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. J.'s mother and father were in a relationship for six years and separated in May 2011 due to father's drug use. J. is their only child.

The investigative narrative attached to the petition states that law enforcement responded to J.'s home on September 30, 2011, due to an allegation of child abuse. J.'s mother, maternal grandmother, and maternal aunt were present. The maternal grandmother and the maternal aunt told the deputy that baby J. had been crawling around the kitchen in mother's way, "so [mother] grabbed him by [the] arm and tossed him about a foot from where she was standing in the kitchen into the living room." The deputy reported that the maternal aunt and maternal grandmother were yelling and screaming at each other. Mother admitted that she had been angry and frustrated with the maternal grandmother and took it out on J., who was not injured in the incident.

The Department's social worker who arrived at the home took J. into protective custody. Mother was not allowed to accompany the social worker and J. to the car because mother did not calm down as requested and had continued to cry and hold J. against her chest while J. was crying and attempting to get away from her.

B. Detention Hearing

After holding a detention hearing, the juvenile court entered its October 20, 2011 findings and order at detention. The court found that (1) a prima facie showing had been made that J. came within section 300; and (2) continuance in the parental home would be

contrary to the child's welfare and there were no reasonable means to protect J.'s physical and emotional health without removal from the parents' physical custody. The court therefore ordered that J. be detained and temporarily placed under the Department's care and supervision until further court order.

C. Jurisdiction/Disposition Report

The Department filed its jurisdiction/disposition report in December 2011. The report added more details regarding the September 30, 2011 incident. When mother was interviewed by the Department's social worker, she stated that at the time of the incident, she was cooking and the maternal grandmother was angering her. Baby J. kept coming into the kitchen, so mother "picked him up by his diaper and his arm and . . . tossed him into the living room." When J.'s father was interviewed, he stated that anger was an ongoing issue with mother and mother's family was always angry and fighting.

Both parents had a criminal history. Mother had one misdemeanor conviction for theft and father had numerous controlled substance convictions as well as convictions for burglary and petty theft. Mother also had an extensive child welfare history as a minor. J. was not placed with his father due to the father's substance abuse and the parents' ongoing physical and verbal arguments.

On October 5, 2011, the juvenile court ordered three supervised visits per week for mother and two supervised visits per week for father. The Department referred both parents to the Parent Center for individual counseling and parenting education, supplied mother with weekly bus passes, and supervised visits between mother and J. The Department reported that "[t]he visits with the mother have been concerning to Parent Center staff and this Department. The Parent Center staff reported that on many occasions the baby has arrived with the foster parent happy and content. When he is given to the mother he pulls away and cries, often inconsolably until the visit supervisor takes the baby from the mother. Once the baby calms down the visit supervisor attempts to give the baby back to the mother and he begins to cry again. This scenario has

occurred off and on throughout the past six weeks. The staff at Parent Center has also expressed concern regarding the mother/baby bond and reported that when the baby is not crying he is often looking at the staff with concern or apprehension.”

The Department recommended that J. be made a dependent of the court and remain in out-of-home care, and that the parents receive family reunification services. Additionally, the Department recommended that the court order a psychological evaluation for mother “to assist her with her mental health and to ensure that the case plan is appropriate”

D. Jurisdiction and Dispositional Orders

The parents submitted on the Department’s jurisdiction/disposition report. Thereafter, on December 14, 2011, the juvenile court filed both the jurisdiction order and the dispositional orders. In the jurisdiction order, the court sustained the allegations of the section 300 petition. In the dispositional orders, the court declared J. a dependent of the court and ordered that J. be removed from his parents’ physical custody. The court also ordered that the parents receive reasonable reunification services and visitation, consisting of a minimum of three supervised visits per week each for mother and father.

E. Sixth-Month Status Review

The Department filed its sixth-month review report on June 7, 2012, stating that mother was participating in most of her case plan activities and visiting J. consistently. Her case plan activities included engagement with Sobriety Works, Family Preservation Court, and Leaps and Bounds. J. had been placed in a foster home, appeared to be developmentally on target, and had been referred to the Dominican Interdisciplinary Child Development Program.

The maternal grandfather was authorized to supervise the visits between mother and J. once a week. Those visits usually took place at a park. Although mother was visiting J. consistently, the Parent Center staff and the Department’s social worker continued to have concerns “in regards to [J.] crying and pulling away from [mother]

each time she tries to hold him.” It was also noted that J. tended to fall often and mother was slow to respond. The Department hoped that involvement with the Leaps and Bounds program would help mother build a healthy attachment with J. Father had been visiting until he was incarcerated.

The Department recommended that J. remain in out-of-home placement and that the parents continue to receive family reunification services. In its six-month review order filed on June 12, 2012, the juvenile court adopted those recommendations, found that there was a substantial probability that J. would be returned to his parent’s physical custody within 12 months, and further ordered that supervised visitation continue with a schedule of three visits per week for mother and two visits per week for father.

F. 12-Month Status Review

1. The Status Review Report

The Department filed its 12-month review report on December 3, 2012. At that time, the Department recommended that family reunification services be terminated and a section 366.26 hearing be set to establish a permanent plan for J. The Department’s recommendation was based on (1) the loss of all contact with father, who had made no efforts to reengage in services or visit J.; (2) during visitation with mother, J. continued to cry and pull away from her and the visits continued to be “challenging”; (3) although mother was making an effort, her progress in parenting abilities was minimal and she had not been able to become a safe and stable parent.

2. The Contested Hearing

The minute orders reflect that a contested 12-month review hearing was held in January 2013, with testimony by the Department’s social worker and mother. The juvenile court also received documentary evidence including visitation logs and Parent Center reports.

3. The Juvenile Court's Order

The January 11, 2013 minute order states that the juvenile court made the following findings and orders: “The Court finds that the Department has provided reasonable services to the parents. The Court finds that the child cannot be returned to the care of the mother today, but the Court does find that there is a substantial probability that the child can be returned and that the Court will continue to provide reunification services to the mother until the[] end of March 2013. [¶] The minor is continued as a dependent child of the court.”

G. The 18-Month Status Review

1. The Status Review Report

The Department filed its 18-month status review report on March 28, 2013. J. was in his second placement, with a non-relative extended family member. Father had moved to another county and had informed the Department that he was not interested in participating in family reunification services. The maternal grandfather had requested that J. be placed with him by filing a section 388 petition. However, when the Department contacted the maternal grandfather's wife, the wife stated that she did not agree with the maternal grandfather's request for placement.²

Although mother had continued to be engaged in her case plan activities, she was unemployed and had not obtained a stable home for herself and J. The Department further reported that mother had “also struggled in moving forward with less structured visits. The Department did move forward with unsupervised visits, but the reports coming back from the Parents Center have been concerning. Both the Department and [mother] agreed it was in [J.'s] best interest to have visits remain supervised at the

² The minute order of May 3, 2013, indicates that the juvenile court denied the section 388 petition.

Parents Center to ensure his safety and to assist [mother] in managing her son's behavior.”

The visit supervisor reported to the Department that at the beginning of the unsupervised visits J. is hesitant to go with mother and often cries and “throws himself back while she is holding him and is resistant to get[ting] in the stroller.” Mother agreed with the Department's decision to change her two visits to supervised visits at the Parent Center. At the Parent Center, beginning in March 2013, it was agreed that if J. did not stop crying, throwing himself back, and stopping his breath after the staff attempted to sooth him for 10 minutes, the visit would end. Mother continued to have one visit per week supervised by the maternal grandfather, usually at a park. Mother's individual counselor reported that mother's progress had been slow and that mother did not have “any insight around what could be causing her son to display concerning behaviors during visits.”

The Department also discovered that mother had not been truthful to service providers about her current living situation and employment status. When the Department asked mother where she was living in February 2013, mother stated she was staying with a friend and refused to give the address. In March 2013, mother reported she was staying with another friend and could not provide any other information about where she was residing. Although mother stated she was attending community college, she did not provide the Department with a copy of her school schedule as requested. Mother's drug tests had been negative except for five missed tests in the period of January 2013 through March 2013, which were considered positive.

The Department concluded that although mother had been engaged in her case plan, she had not made the behavioral changes that would cause the Department to believe that she could safely parent J. The Department noted that mother had exceeded the statutory time limits for reunification with a child under three years of age and

recommended that reunification services be terminated and a section 366.26 permanency planning hearing be set.

2. The Contested Hearing

Department Social Workers' Testimony

Three of the Department's social workers testified at the contested 18-month review hearing held in April and May of 2013. At the time of the hearing, Beatriz Monjaras was a senior social worker who had been assigned to J.'s case for 18 months. Stephanie Vikati was a social worker supervisor who had supervised the case since August 2012. Connie Drummond was a social worker who supervised mother's visits with J. during April 2013.

Monjaras testified about her recommendation that J. not be returned to his parents. After the 12-month review hearing, from January 30, 2013, until the end of February 2013, mother continued to have one supervised visit at the Parent Center and one visit that was "loosely supervised," meaning that mother took J. out into the community by herself for one hour after checking in at the Parent Center to pick up J. Mother would return J. to the Parent Center at the end of the visit. Parent Center staff reported to Monjaras that J. did not want to leave with mother; he would often run away from her and refuse to get in the stroller. Once in his stroller, staff would hear J. crying as he went with mother "down the street." At the third loosely supervised visit, mother returned within 10 minutes because J. would not stop crying. Mother told Monjaras that she did not feel it was safe for her to have J. out in the community unsupervised.

Monjaras supervised mother's visits with J. at the Parenting Center in March 2013. She observed J. crying, arching his back, not wanting to go in the room with mother, and not wanting to be consoled by mother. The Department had provided services to help mother gain parenting skills, including individual counseling, parenting classes and the Leaps and Bounds program. Mother's progress had been minimal although she had put forth a good effort.

Staff at the Parent Center notified Monjaras that J. continued to be distressed and did not want to go with mother on the unsupervised visits out in the community. After March 15, 2013, all of the visits were supervised at the Parent Center.

At the conclusion of Monjaras's testimony, the juvenile court continued the case to April 30, 2013, and issued interim orders. The court ordered that mother have a minimum of three loosely supervised visits with J. per week until April 30, 2013; that the maternal grandfather not supervise any visits; that visitation not take place during J.'s naptime; and that Jennifer Danielle Buer from Leaps and Bounds supervise some visits and testify when the hearing resumed. The court also stated: "Now, obviously if the child is distressed and inconsolable, if it's longer than ten minutes then you come back to the Parent Center or whatever the safe place is, because I'm not going to have him out there a whole hour completely distressed and stressed out. But we need to figure out what the nature of the visits are and whether or not this is a transition he's having a tough situation with."

When the hearing resumed, the witnesses included Monjaras's supervisor, Vikati, who has had a supervisory role in this case since August 2012 and was involved in developing the Department's recommendations. Vikati also testified as an expert in the area of risk assessment for dependent children. She stated that although mother has greatly improved in her interaction with J., he does not identify her as the source of comfort and often rejects her appropriate attempts to provide nurturance. Vikati found it unusual that a child would have that kind of response to a parent seen three times during every week.

In Vikati's view, J. would be at substantial risk of emotional detriment if returned to mother's care because he has displayed emotional duress during the majority of visits and mother was not able to calm and comfort him. Vikati also believed that J.'s physical safety would be at risk, due to mother's dishonesty about her continuing contact with the maternal grandmother and the maternal aunt and the potential for the maternal

grandmother to become part of J.'s home life. Additionally, Vikati was concerned about mother's refusal to give her current address to the Department, which had prevented the Department from facilitating visitation in mother's home.

Drummond testified regarding her observations while loosely supervising the seven visits that took place during the three weeks immediately preceding the hearing. The visits consisted of Drummond and J. meeting mother at a park, followed by Drummond staying back and observing them. J.'s reaction to mother varied. At the beginning of one visit, J. screamed in a negative way and did not want to get out of the car when mother approached him. At the beginning of another visit, J. grabbed Drummond, turned his head away from mother, and said "no." During the visit on the Monday before the hearing, J. asked repeatedly for his "daddy," meaning his foster father, and did not respond to mother's attempts to engage him. After 15 or 20 minutes, Drummond stepped in and suggested that they play a water game.

While observing the visits, Drummond never saw J. give mother any form of affection or take her hand, although he would sit still for mother to brush his hair. Drummond did observe some visits that went smoothly, with mother and J. playing on the slides and with toys that mother would bring.

Drummond was also asked to assess the home of C., mother's friend, as a potential placement. C. cancelled two appointments and told Drummond that mother and J. could only stay in her home for six weeks due to landlord concerns.

Parent/Interaction Therapist's Testimony

After the hearing resumed, Buer testified as requested by the juvenile court. Buer is a children's services coordinator at Leaps and Bounds, which is a program that works with parents and children. The court accepted Buer as an expert in parent/child interaction therapy and assessment of a parent's ability to respond to a child's physical and emotional needs.

From January 2013 until shortly before the hearing, Buer saw mother and J. every other week. During the last three weeks, Buer saw them once a week in a more hands-on role. Buer would pick up J. from his caregiver and meet mother at a park. Mother greeted J. with affection and J. would smile when she opened the car door. While at the park, they would watch the skateboarders and then J., an adventurous child, would roam in the park. Mother and Buer also taught J. to go down the slides and to go up stairs. However, J. would become upset when mother tried to carry him or put her hands on him to make sure he was okay. Most of the time when they were going to another place in the park, J. grabbed Buer's hand instead of mother's hand.

In the past few months, Buer had noticed a disruption in the relationship of mother and J. She happened to be at the Parent Center when J. was dropped off by his foster father, and saw J. having a very hard time letting go of his foster father and going into the care of mother. J. would be upset, crying and grasping his foster father. During the year that Buer has been working with mother and J., she has been concerned that J. does not seek out mother for nurturing. J.'s interaction with mother is not what she would expect to see between a two-year-old and his mother.

If J. were transitioned to mother's care, Buer would anticipate a very strong emotional reaction from him. Buer's opinion is that mother does not fully have the skills that she would need to handle J.'s emotional trauma.

Testimony of Mother and Friend

During the three months preceding the hearing, mother has been working on domestic violence and anger management issues with her individual counselor. She has also been attending parenting classes that have helped her to communicate with J. and understand his physical cues. She believes that her first visit with J. out in the community went well. The second visit occurred when two police officers were shot in Santa Cruz and there was a lot of commotion. She returned J. to the Parent Center that

time due to safety concerns. The third visit took place at the Parent Center because mother feels that J. is most comfortable there, due to having a set routine.

According to mother, her visits with J. are better when they are supervised by the maternal grandfather at the park where they can engage in more play activities than they can at the more confined Parent Center. Mother did not recall telling Parent Center staff that she wanted to stay at the Parent Center because she could not control J. outside.

Mother wants J. returned to her care because she wants to bond with him and show her family and the community that she can be a safe parent for him. If J. were returned to her care, mother believes that she would be able to ensure his safety. Mother's plan is that she and J. would live in a room at her friend C.'s apartment and go to C.'s workplace during the day until mother obtained more permanent child care. Mother is still searching for employment and is currently maintaining her sobriety by going to AA/NA meetings.

At the beginning of her testimony, Mother remained unwilling to disclose with whom and where she was currently living, since she was staying with an aunt who was uncomfortable about giving her exact address and was in the process of moving. When the hearing resumed, mother testified that she was living with her friend, C. When J. is returned to mother, they can stay with C. for six weeks. After that, mother's plan is to work with Families in Transition to find housing. Her alternative plan is to live with her paternal grandmother. Mother is currently searching for licensed daycare for J. If J. were to be returned to her tomorrow, her plan is to take him to C.'s workplace and to the park and spend time bonding with him. Mother believes that she would be able to bond with J. in the home setting where she can cook for him, bath him, put him to bed and read him stories.

3. The Juvenile Court's Order

At the conclusion of testimony on May 3, 2013, the juvenile court ruled from the bench that the court found by a preponderance of the evidence that return of J. to

mother's care "would create a substantial risk of detriment to his safety, protection, physical and emotional well-being." The court further found by clear and convincing evidence that the Department had offered reasonable services, especially the Leaps and Bounds program.

Explaining its ruling, the juvenile court stated that at the time of the 12-month review hearing in January 2013, the court felt that mother had made progress in her case plan and that with additional services mother might be able to make more progress in her case plan, obtain stable housing, and demonstrate that there would not be a detriment to J. in returning him to her care.

However, when the Department filed its 18-month status report, the court found that mother had not progressed to unsupervised and overnight visits as expected. Since mother did not have stable housing, the court found that mother "basically took herself out of the opportunity to move to unsupervised and overnight visits." The court further found that mother had not "shown the stability that the Court needs in order to move forward with returning [J.] to her today. [¶] At 18 months I can't say we have more time to let [mother] figure [it out] for a few more months. . . . [¶] I feel like I keep hoping, hanging on for mom, because I've been one of her cheerleaders. I'd hoped that I would have a totally different situation today. And unfortunately I have to look at the child's overall situation, his overall safety and well-being." The court found significant Buer's testimony that J. would have strong emotions if he were to be returned to mother, and that mother did not have enough skills around social and emotional issues to meet J.'s needs.

In its written order filed on May 7, 2013, the juvenile court terminated reunification services to mother and father and set the section 366.25 permanency planning hearing for August 29, 2013.

H. *The Mother's Writ Petition*

Mother filed a petition for extraordinary writ pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.452³ on May 30, 2013, seeking relief from the May 7, 2013 order terminating reunification services setting the section 366.26 hearing. The Department responded with a letter to this court, filed on June 7, 2013, in which the Department requested that mother's writ petition be dismissed on the ground that the petition failed to identify any juvenile court error and also failed to include any argument or legal authorities.

On June 11, 2013, this court issued an order to show cause why mother's writ petition should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the requirements of rule 8.452(a) and (b), and allowed the parties to file responses.

Mother, now self-represented, filed a document entitled "Appellants opening brief" on July 8, 2013. We understand mother to argue in her brief that the Department did not properly implement unsupervised visitation because she was not allowed unsupervised visitation until January 30, 2013, which did not allow sufficient time for bonding.

The Department filed a letter brief on July 15, 2013, arguing that mother's writ petition should be dismissed for failure to provide citation to the record or legal authority supporting her argument. Alternatively, the Department argues that the record shows that "there was abundant evidence concerning efforts to facilitate and improve visitation between mother and child, and the visitation was scheduled for multiple times a week over an eighteen-month period—despite this child being under three when he came into the dependency system with services ordinarily limited to six months [citation.]"

³ All further rule references are to the California Rules of Court unless otherwise indicated.

III. DISCUSSION

Before evaluating mother's contentions, we will provide an overview of the statutory requirements for the termination of reunification services, including visitation, as well the applicable standard of review.

A. Termination of Reunification Services

Section 361.5, subdivision (a), generally mandates that reunification services are to be provided whenever a child is removed from the parents' custody. (See *In re Luke L.* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 670, 678 (*Luke L.*)) "Only where there is clear and convincing evidence the [Department] has provided or offered reasonable services may the court order a section 366.26 hearing." (*Robin V. v. Superior Court* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 1158, 1165 (*Robin V.*); § 366.21, subd. (g)(2).)

"Reunification services must be 'designed to eliminate those conditions that led to the court's finding that the child is a person described by Section 300.' (§ 362, subd. (c).) Accordingly, a reunification plan must be appropriately based on the particular family's 'unique facts.' [Citation.]" (*In re T.G.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 687, 696; see *Luke L., supra*, 44 Cal.App.4th at p. 678.) " "[T]he record should show that the [Department] identified the problems leading to the loss of custody, offered services designed to remedy those problems, maintained reasonable contact with the parents during the course of the service plan, and made reasonable efforts to assist the parents in areas where compliance proved difficult . . ." [Citation.] [Citation.]" (*In re T.G., supra*, at p. 697; *David B. v. Superior Court* (2004) 123 Cal.App.4th 768, 793-794.)

"Among its components, the reunification plan must include visitation. (§ 362.1.) That visitation must be as frequent as possible, consistent with the well-being of the minor. (*Ibid.*)" (*Luke L., supra*, 44 Cal.App.4th at p. 679; § 362.1, subd. (a)(1); rule 5.695(h)(5).) However, "[n]o visitation order shall jeopardize the safety of the child." (§ 362.1, subd. (a)(1)(B).)

“The adequacy of reunification plans and the reasonableness of the [Department’s] efforts are judged according to the circumstances of each case.” (*Robin V.*, *supra*, 33 Cal.App.4th at p. 1164; *Amanda H. v. Superior Court* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1340, 1345.) That additional services might have been possible, or that the services provided were not the services the parent thought were best for the family, does not render the services offered or provided inadequate. “ ‘The standard is not whether the services provided were the best that might be provided in an ideal world, but whether the services were reasonable under the circumstances.’ ” (*In re T.G.*, *supra*, 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 697; *In re Misako R.* (1991) 2 Cal.App.4th 538, 547 (*Misako R.*).

On appeal, the applicable standard of review is sufficiency of the evidence. (*Kevin R. v. Superior Court* (2010) 191 Cal.App.4th 676, 688 (*Kevin R.*)). “In reviewing the reasonableness of the services provided, this court must view the evidence in a light most favorable to the [Department]. We must indulge in all legitimate and reasonable inferences to uphold the [juvenile court’s findings]. If there is substantial evidence supporting the judgment, our duty ends and the judgment must not be disturbed.” (*Misako R.*, *supra*, 2 Cal.App.4th at p. 545; *In re Monica C.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 296, 306.) “We have no power to judge the effect or value of the evidence, to weigh the evidence, to consider the credibility of witnesses or to resolve conflicts in the evidence or the reasonable inferences which may be drawn from that evidence.” (*In re Casey D.* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 38, 52-53.)

B. Analysis

Whether appellate review is sought in a writ proceeding or in an appeal, we apply the general rule that the trial court’s judgment or order is presumed correct and error must be affirmatively shown. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) Where, as here, our standard of review requires that we review the juvenile court’s order for substantial evidence (*Kimberly R. v. Superior Court* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1067, 1078; *Kevin R.*, *supra*, 191 Cal.App.4th at p. 688), the party challenging the order “has the

burden to demonstrate that there is no evidence of a sufficiently substantial character to support the [order].” (*In re Geoffrey G.* (1979) 98 Cal.App.3d 412, 420; see also *In re N.M.* (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 159, 169.)

Here, mother has made no effort to demonstrate that the juvenile court’s orders are not supported by substantial evidence. Having reviewed the entire record on appeal, we determine that substantial evidence supports the court’s orders terminating reunification services, including visitation. The evidence shows that the Department provided mother with a minimum of three visits with J. per week, beginning in October 2011, less than one week after nine-month-old J. was removed from mother’s physical custody on September 30, 2011. The visitation schedule continued until the juvenile court terminated reunification services at the conclusion of the 18-month contested hearing on May 3, 2013. Mother therefore had visitation with J. for more than 18 months.

The evidence also shows that the Department provided mother with two periods of loosely supervised visitation, which gave mother the opportunity to take J. into the community on her own for an hour. At the third loosely supervised visit in February 2013, mother returned J. to the Parent Center in 10 minutes because J. would not stop crying and mother did not feel it was safe for her to her to have J. out in the community unsupervised. Mother also had loosely supervised visitation in April 2013 at the juvenile court’s order. The Department could not facilitate unsupervised visitation in mother’s home because she did not have stable housing and had refused to disclose where and with whom she was living. Thus, there is substantial evidence that even after 18 months of visitation, mother was not able to progress to unsupervised visitation that would be safe for J.

We accordingly determine that substantial evidence supports the juvenile court’s findings that the Department has provided or offered reasonable reunification services, including visitation, to mother (§ 362.1, subd. (a)(1)). We will therefore deny mother’s

writ petition on that ground. Having reached this conclusion, we need not address the Department's request for dismissal of the writ petition.

IV. DISPOSITION

The petition for extraordinary writ is denied.

BAMATTRE-MANOUKIAN, J.

WE CONCUR:

ELIA, ACTING P.J.

MÁRQUEZ, J.